# EXHIBIT E



(Convention de La Haye du 5 Octobre 1961)

- Country: United States of America
   This public document
- 2. has been signed by Luis M. Diaz
- 3. acting in the capacity of County Clerk
- 4. bears the seal/stamp of the county of Bronx

#### Certified

- 5. at New York City, New York
- 6. the 9th day of January 2019
- 7. by Deputy Secretary of State for Business and Licensing Services, State of New York
- 8. No. NYC-1166586
- 9. Seal/Stamp

10. Signature



Whitney A. Clark

Whitney a Clark

Deputy Secretary of State for Business and Licensing Services

STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF BRONX
COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE

SS:

I, Luis M. Diaz, County Clerk of the County of Bronx, State of New York and also Clerk of the Supreme Court in and for said County and State the same being a Court of Record and having a seal;

DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT SCHANFIELD, NAOMI SC2545542 Term 3/18/2016 to 3/18/2020

Whose name is subscribed to the annexed affidavit, deposition, certificate of acknowledgment or proof, was at the time of taking the same a NOTARY PUBLIC in and for the State of New York, duly commissioned and sworn and qualified to act as such throughout the State of New York; that pursuant to law a commission, or a certificate of their official character, and autograph signature, have been filed in my office; that as such the Notary Public was duly authorized by the laws of the State of New York to administer oaths and affirmations, to receive and certify the acknowledgment or proof of deeds, mortgages, powers of attorney and other written instruments for lands, tenements and hereditaments to be read in evidence or recorded in this State, to protest notes and to take and certify affidavits and depositions; and that I am well acquainted with the handwriting of such Notary Public of have compared the signature on the annexed instrument with their autograph signature deposited in my office,

IN WITNESS WHERE OF, have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal at Bronx, Bronx County, New York on January 9, 2019

LUIS M. DIAZ BRONX COUNTY CLERK



\$

# Department of State

#### STATE OF NEW YORK

### **DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

ONE COMMERCE PLAZA
99 WASHINGTON AVENUE
ALBANY, NY 12231-0001
WWW.DOS.NY.GOV

Use this affidavit at your own risk. The Department of State (the "Department") does not guarantee that this affidavit is suitable for all purposes, or that this affidavit will be accepted by any other office for filing. The user of this affidavit agrees to hold the Department harmless for any and all claims which may arise as a result of completing this affidavit. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this affidavit, please consult with an attorney. The Department is not responsible for any errors caused as a result of completing this affidavit.

THE STATE OF NEW YORK  COUNTY OF NEW YORK	AFFIDAVIT
I, Not Bike (Print Name)	_, being duly sworn, deposes and says:
1. I have affixed hereto the following document: せんへんいけん (Description)	cf court allearance; ibe the document which is affixed)
2. The document attached hereto is: (check one):  an original;	
a true copy having obtained the same from:(Indica	te where the document was obtained)
ath	Signature of Affiant
Sworn to before me on this	
NATION NA	MI SCHANFIELD  Welle, State of New Patien #02SC627  Patien in Bronx Co.  Patien in Bronx Co.

--- REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY ---

```
1
 1
 2
     SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
     COUNTY OF NEW YORK - CIVIL TERM - PART 31
 3
     MAKHPAL KARIBZHANOVA,
 4
                                              Plaintiff,
 5
              -against-
                                   Index No. 309346/17
 6
     AIDAN KARIBZHANOV,
 7
                                              Defendant.
          ----X
 8
                                       71 Thomas Street
 9
                                       New York, New York
                                       January 4, 2019
10
     BEFORE:
11
                    HONORABLE LAURA DRAGER,
12
                              Supreme Court Justice
13
     APPEARANCES:
14
15
     NEWMAN & DENNEY, PC
    Attorneys for the Plaintiff 570 Lexington Avenue
16
    New York, New York 10022
17
     BY: LOUIS I. NEWMAN, ESQ.
18
     BIKEL & SCHANFIELD
19
    Attorneys for the Defendant
     18 East 48th Street
20
    New York, New York 10017 BY: DROR BIKEL, ESQ.
21
    BY:
          DANIT HALBERSTEIN, ESQ.
22
                           (Continued)
23
24
25
26
```

```
1
  2
      APPEARANCES:
  3
      THE LAW OFFICES OF DIAMOND & FEE, PLLC
      Attorneys for the Child
150 East 58th Street
New York, New York 10155
  4
  5
      BY: TARA DIAMOND, ESQ.
 6
  7
      JO ANN DOUGLAS, ESQ.
      Attorney for the Child
  8
      170 Second Avenue
  9
      New York, New York 10003
10
11
12
      ALSO PRESENT: ANNA TOKMAKOFF
13
                        (Russian Interpreter)
14
15
16
                                     Diane Kavanaugh, RPR
17
                                     Senior Court Reporter
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
```

Proceedings

COURT OFFICER: Calling Index No. 309346 of 2017 in the matter of Karibzhanova v. Karibzhanov.

Counsel, your appearances.

MR. NEWMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor.

For the plaintiff, Newman and Denney, 570

Lexington Avenue, New York, New York, by Louis I.

Newman.

My client is to my immediate right.

MR. BIKEL: Good afternoon, your Honor.

Dror Bikel, Bikel and Schanfield, with Danit Halberstein, for the defendant, 18 East 48th Street, suite 1001, New York, New York 10017.

MS. DIAMOND: Tara Diamond, Law Offices of Diamond and Fee, 150 East 58th Street, New York, New York 10155, appearing on behalf of the child.

Good afternoon, your Honor.

MS. DOUGLAS: Good afternoon, your Honor.

Jo Ann Douglas, appointed as co-guardian for the child.

THE INTERPRETER: Anna Tokmakoff, Russian interpreter.

THE COURT: Please be seated.

MR. BIKEL: I believe my client will take the child back to Kazakhstan. His visa doesn't allow him to stay here. His mother is also sick. It's not possible.

						_				
Ρ:	r	$\sim$	$\overline{}$	$\bigcirc$	$\bigcirc$	d	i	n	$\alpha$	9

So he'll drop the order of protection.

THE COURT: The issue of the custodial obligations with respect to the child is not really what I am dealing with right now.

What I am asking is what you are planning to do about the order of protection proceeding.

MR. BIKEL: We are going to withdraw it.

THE COURT: Fine. Thank you. That was really all I needed to hear.

If the order of protection -- now, that's one issue.

There is a second issue which concerns the action by the plaintiff.

MR. NEWMAN: If I may, your Honor.

 $\label{thm:problem} \mbox{We would respectfully request that the Court} \\ \mbox{retain jurisdiction.}$ 

THE COURT: Retain jurisdiction of what?

MR. NEWMAN: Of the divorce action, your Honor, which also --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. NEWMAN: Which also includes equitable distribution and all the other incidental relief.

I would respectfully point out to the Court, as I mentioned in our conference, that the Supreme Court of Kazakhstan has undertaken to hear the appeal on the

#### Proceedings

divorce that was heard in Kazakhstan. That will be heard on the 23rd of January.

As I understand it, they will be deciding whether or not to dismiss the entire case or allow the Judgment of Divorce to stand.

So in which case --

THE COURT: The only thing, as I understand, that is before the Court in Kazakhstan is whether to dismiss -- whether to vacate the Judgment of Divorce. Any other issue related to finances was appropriately before the Court.

And, in fact, as I understand it, the parties were instructed that they could proceed on the financial issues, which are dealt with separately.

The only reason why I have kept the Judgment of Divorce matter -- the divorce action pending here has been because there was a lack of clarity about the divorce proceedings in Kazakhstan, and also because there was pending the order of protection matter.

At this point in time, though, there is a Judgment of Divorce. It's not that the Judgment of Divorce has been vacated. And, in fact, it is my -- in Kazakhstan.

In fact, it is my understanding that there was already an appellate action regarding the Judgment of

#### Proceedings

Divorce in Kazakhstan that resulted in the favor of retaining the Judgment of Divorce.

Am I correct?

- 5

MR. BIKEL: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So at this point I believe the application for the Judgment of Divorce in New York is untimely and should be dismissed.

If, in fact, the Court in Kazakhstan vacates the Judgment of Divorce, then you are free to take whatever step you want.

But even under -- the only way that this Court would take jurisdiction is if that divorce action was outright dismissed. If all that they do is vacate the Judgment of Divorce, the divorce action in Kazakhstan would have priority.

It is my understanding that the husband lives primarily in Kazakhstan. I'm not quite clear, but it seemed to me that the reason why the wife was here was because the unemancipated daughter was living here because the parties agreed that the child should attend a private school in New York, at least in part because of her talent, and that that was a choice that the parents had made.

But I don't see why at this stage New York has any basis to retain jurisdiction of this action. And if

#### Proceedings

it is the case -- I also understand that the daughter is a senior in high school at this point, that she has applied to colleges, I don't know where and I don't need to know where, and that those applications are pending.

So that even if the father were to remove the child to Kazakhstan for some period of time, it would not be as disruptive as it might have been if it was earlier in this year, because we all know what happens the second half of senior year in high school, which is not much. So that I don't think it would necessarily be so damaging to the child if that were to happen.

I certainly think it would be better for this child to have some parental oversight, which has not been what is occurring while she has been in Manhattan.

I don't see a basis to retain this case.

MR. NEWMAN: If I may, your Honor.

It is my understanding that the Supreme Court in Kazakhstan has undertaken the appeal. And that, in reading the documents, and I can certainly provide translations for the Court, that they are going to determine whether or not the case in its entirety should be dismissed, not that they will --

THE COURT: But they haven't done that yet.

MR. NEWMAN: I understand that, your Honor. It is going to be heard on the 23rd of January.

#### Proceedings

THE COURT: I'm not interested, though.

Quite frankly, I have to tell you, counsel, this has been pending before me since 2017. At the time this -- I mean, really, there's been a lot of misrepresentations here, and not on your part, I understand that. You were not involved in the case early on.

MR. NEWMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: But that a divorce action was even filed here, at the time it was filed, was improper, since there was a Judgment of Divorce that had been filed -- had been obtained in Kazakhstan.

Then, I mean, I did keep it open, as I said, largely because there was the order of protection matter that was pending. I went through great efforts --

I'm sorry, is this inconvenient to you? To have you look at your watch, sir, since you have been so unresponsive to the Court. You are a man who left your child here unattended for months. And it was only because of the action that this Court took to protect this child legally if something had happened to her in your continued absence from her life. So I'm sorry if this is inconvenient to you.

The only reason why I kept this divorce action pending was because of the open other matter and because

Proceedings 1 2 this is the second time that I am being told that there 3 was an appellate process proceeding. And after the 4 first appellate process, the Judgment of Divorce stood. 5 I have no basis to believe that the Judgment of 6 Divorce won't stand. And if it doesn't stand, and if the entire case 7 8 is dismissed, you can make whatever further application 9 you want for a divorce at that time. But it is entirely 10 improper for this Court to have this divorce action at 11 this time. 12 MR. NEWMAN: May I --13 THE COURT: So the action is dismissed. 14 The matter of the order of protection is 15 withdrawn. 16 And, counsel, you have to take it upon yourself 17 to advise the Court when the child has been removed. 18 I assume that the father is immediately going 19 to remove the child, because I have three guardians in 20 I need to end their stewardship of his daughter. 21 MR. BIKEL: My client is telling me within a 22 week. 23 THE COURT: Well, I expect to have -- you're 24 coming back to court in a week with proof that the child

has been removed because I don't believe your client.

I want to see that the child, in fact, has been

25

26

#### Proceedings

removed. I want to see that she has been withdrawn from the school.

There are a lot of other players here whose lives have been disrupted by the failure of this family to treat anyone in this country respectfully.

There's a school that has to be notified where the child has to be withdrawn. This Court has to be formally notified so that the guardianships can end.

And you have a week to do it.

MR. NEWMAN: On behalf of my client, we would oppose any removal of the child from this jurisdiction where she has lived for the last several years. And this is her home.

MS. DIAMOND: Your Honor, for the record, I understand why the child needs to be removed. If dad can't be here to be with the child, once your Honor's order is lifted, there's no question that the mom is going to be at the child's home.

As your Honor has said repeatedly, the only way to really protect Iman is to have her dad there to be able to protect her. And if that means he can't be here, while yes, it's unfortunate that she would need to change schools in the middle of her senior year, that is, at this point, what's going to be necessary to keep this child safe and to protect her, given her extremely

#### Proceedings

fragile mental health state right now.

THE COURT: May I hear from Miss Douglas, who is a co-guardian in this matter.

MS. DOUGLAS: Your Honor, I would just echo what Miss Diamond said.

I would make it crystal clear that keeping this child safe isn't simply being safe from her mother.

It's being safe even from the fear that her mother may accost her sometime. She's not prepared for that right now.

THE COURT: The Court should also note that I have met with the child. And I am aware of her fragile circumstances. I am also aware of the mother's fragile circumstances.

I'm not trying in any way to suggest how this came about, what responsibility, if any, the mother bears in what has occurred. I do think that, irrespective of the mother, that the daughter has some significant issues. And the one thing that I do know is that it is in her best interest to be with parental supervision.

This Court cannot be a substitute, nor can any order of protection be a substitute, for parental supervision.

Whatever unfortunate break in the relationship

## Proceedings

between the mother and daughter that has occurred cannot be repaired by this Court. And obviously the mother cannot -- and I am not faulting her for this, but the mother cannot at this point be the responsible parent for this child. It's very unfortunate, but I can't do anything about that at this point in time.

I am far more concerned that the child be under appropriate parental supervision. Perhaps if the child were stronger, the arrangement that had been created might have worked. But I think that it's just not appropriate. And I really do think that the only solution here is for the child to be with the one parent who she is comfortable being with at this point in time.

I do hope at some time, and this child will be turning 18, custody will no longer be an issue, I hope at that time that eventually a relationship between the mother and daughter can occur.

But based on the history of this case, my own observations of the daughter, what I have heard from both Miss Diamond and from Miss Douglas, and given that we're in the second half of the senior year in high school, I do believe that the best solution, admittedly not a great solution, is for the daughter to be with the father.

And since the father says he cannot stay in the

# Proceedings

United States, which would have been an alternative that I would have accepted, I don't see any other option but for the child to leave with the father to return to Kazakhstan.

I do not believe that this Court has jurisdiction at this time to entertain the divorce action, given that there is a Judgment of Divorce.

The divorce action here is dismissed. I can't predict the future.

The order of protection action is withdrawn.

And the only thing that remains is the oversight that this Court now has as a result of the guardianship proceeding that I will adjourn until -- I can't do the 14th. I will put this on for January 15th.

MS. DOUGLAS: Thank you.

THE COURT: For proof that the child has been returned to Kazakhstan, with proof. I need some real proof.

MR. BIKEL: I understand.

THE COURT: And I don't need Miss Diamond here.

I need Miss Douglas here on that date to address the dismissal of the guardianship proceeding.

MS. DOUGLAS: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: January 15th. Thank you.

MR. BIKEL: 9:30?

1.8

Proceedings THE COURT: 9:30. COURT OFFICER: Parties step back. Certified to be a true and accurate transcript of the stenographic minutes taken within. Diane Kavanaugh, RPR
Senior Court Reporter ;S